

The Times - Dispatch

DAILY - WEEKLY - SUNDAY.
Business Office: 215 E. Main Street
South Richmond, Va.
Post Office: 109 N. Main Street
Richmond, Va.
Telephone: 100

BY MAIL One Six Three Mo.
POSTAGE PAID Year. Mo. Mo. Mo.
Daily without Sunday \$4.00 \$10.00 \$1.00
Daily without Sunday \$4.00 \$10.00 \$1.00
Sunday edition only \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00
Weekly (Wednesday) \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg.

One Week
Daily without Sunday \$1.00
Daily without Sunday \$1.00
Sunday only \$1.00

Entered January 27, 1906, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1911.

GOOD FOR FIVE MORE.

"Mr. Bryan loses his temper," is the headline of an editorial article in the Houston Post published several days ago. It has reference to the great Nebraskaan's attempt to compel Chairman Underwood and the Democrats of the House to adopt his view on the wool question. They would not follow his advice and Mr. Bryan has said some things about them and their course which have subjected him to severe animadversion on the part of those who are so ready to discredit anything that he does or says, and now comes the Houston Post with the complaint that "Mr. Bryan loses his temper." Mr. Bryan never loses his temper, but if he should, goaded by the unfriendly and disloyal comments of a gainsaying so-called Democratic Journalism, it is not to be wondered at. Mr. Bryan is but mortal, after all. He is a man just like other men—animated by the same spirit, controlled by the same limitations; a creature of like passions with the rest of his race—and if he should lose his temper at times, which he does, of course, it is only a manifestation of his human nature. Says the Texas paper, "Mr. Bryan's custom of denouncing those who do not agree with him as creators of monopoly or special interests is one of the most offensive phases of his demagoguery. If he thinks he can palm off on the public his past and tongue lash the party leaders and the party newspapers into acquiescence, it is time he was learning better. He is just one individual in the party, entitled to his views and to express them just as any individual is, and no more."

A good deal depends upon the individual, of course, but manifestly an individual who has controlled in three presidential elections something like six million of the voters of this country, is not "just one individual." He is six million individuals in fact, and it is this the point we would commend to the prayerful consideration of the Editor of the disreputable Houston paper. What it has mistaken for "temper" on Mr. Bryan's part has only been earnestness, but he has had enough, surely, to worry him and make him speak at times in rather harsh, if affectionate, terms of those who have crossed his path and endeavored to expose his many weaknesses. Besides, when the very citadel of truth itself is assaulted, Mr. Bryan being the citadel, it is not at all to be wondered at that he should speak with positiveness as to the lapses of the Democrats whom he would keep in the straight way.

Five more candidates in him, we should say, judging from his increasing physical and mental vigor, and as long as Mr. Bryan is running for office the country is pretty safe to get a worthy President in his place.

FAIR PLAY FOR BOTH SIDES.

Railroad trains in South Carolina are required to come to a full stop before crossing the track of another railroad. In the opinion of the Abbeville Press and Banner, the law should be amended so that it will apply to all automobiles and vehicles drawn by horses, and that provision should be made denying those who fail to stop the right to sue for damages. "On the other hand," says the Abbeville paper, "the railroads should have the right to sue every man who neglects to obey this requirement. A citizen should have no more right to obstruct a running train with his old buggy or fast-running automobile than he has to put a cross-tie on the track."

There's lots of common sense and absolute justice in that suggestion, although it is a little surprising to find a newspaper in these unbusiness-chasing days arguing that the railroads have any rights that should be regarded. Do they not enjoy peculiar privileges? Has not the State granted them immensely valuable privileges, and is it not the duty of the State to exercise the right of eminent domain in dealing with the railroad corporations created by its liberal hand? There is a good deal of humbug in this claim, to be sure; but it always takes with certain classes of the people. There is a good deal of humbug in much that we do against the corporations.

accomplished by the shippers. Goods shipped by the railroads or steamships should not only be carefully packed in substantial cases, but these cases should be sealed, and no transportation company should be held for damages when goods are not so packed and sealed.

The suggestions made by the Abbeville paper are capable of great expansion. Stealing from a corporation is as criminal as stealing by a corporation.

RICHMOND AND ATLANTA.

Alexander Dixon, of Washington, has been talking to the hotel reporter of the Birmingham Age-Herald about Richmond and Atlanta. He says that this city has been growing and improving faster in the past five years than in any previous like period in its history. He goes on to say:

"I have visited Richmond and Atlanta frequently within the past ten days, and I never expected to see the time when the Virginia capital would catch up with the Georgia capital, either in population or large building. Atlanta, with its population of 150,000, is moving at a rapid pace, and is ahead of Richmond by about 25,000, but, from all appearances, the latter city is doing more building of every kind than Atlanta, and by 1920 the census takers will probably find as many people in Richmond as they will be able to count in Atlanta."

"Richmond has led most Southern cities in accumulated wealth ever since the war, but in the matter of public spirit it was easily outclassed by Atlanta. Now the 'get-together' spirit, as it is called in evidence in Richmond, is in Atlanta or any other city. The old Confederate capital has certainly got a move on it that I had never expected to see, but that I am glad indeed to note. It is one of the most interesting cities historically in the United States, but I fear that in its present condition it is being outclassed by the more modern cities. It is a city of the future, and will crowd out the few landmarks that are left."

If anything, this understates the case in so far as Richmond is concerned. By the next census Atlanta will be nowhere near the tape when Richmond comes racing in. In building operations, in population and in the "get-together" spirit, Richmond is really ahead of Atlanta now, when the matter of area is taken into consideration as a basis for calculation.

In ten years, allowing for further inflated territorial expansion by Atlanta, Richmond will still be farther in the real lead.

RAILROADS GETTING TOO MUCH.

Postmaster-General Hitchcock is giving his department "a business administration." Having caught up with the expenditures of the mail service and paid off something like \$17,000,000 in the course of two years, he now intends to take up the question of carrying the mails with the great transportation companies, the big trunk lines, in his opinion, being largely overpaid by the Government for this service. He believes that a saving of \$9,000,000 can be effected without doing injustice to the carrying lines. Inquiry has brought out the fact that of the 394 companies from which reports have been received, 278 are making profits from mail transportation, while 116 are incurring losses. The Government does not wish to have this service rendered without fair compensation, but if Hitchcock's plans go through the conditions will be changed so that a reasonable profit can be made on this business by all the companies, and without disadvantage to the public. By making a readjustment of the charges for mail service on a basis of a profit of 6 per cent. to all railways carrying mails, the Postmaster-General estimates that practically \$2,000,000 can be saved to the Government annually. Congress will be asked to authorize such readjustments, and once it has been effected the Postmaster-General is of opinion that it will be practicable to reduce letter postage to 1 cent, which will be of enormous value to the business interests of the country.

Hitchcock has been much censured by a great many of the newspapers and politicians, but he appears to have managed the affairs of his department in a more businesslike way than it was ever managed before. Some of his critics claim that the deficits he has met and the economies he has introduced are largely a matter of book-keeping, but we do not believe anything of the sort. The figures would seem to show that in these matters, whatever the pernicious character of Hitchcock's political activities, he has managed his office with very strict regard to business detail. It is largely to his credit that he has been able to accomplish anything in the circumstances.

FOUR OR CLARK?

Senator Reed, of Missouri, has called attention to the fact that the Democrats of that State in their convention last year endorsed former Governor Folk for the Presidency and insists that all Missouri Democrats are bound by the action of this convention. Naturally, the friends of the Honorable Champ Clark are disturbed by this change in the situation and Senator Reed has implicit faith in the candor and fairness of Missouri's Democrats and thinks he takes no hazard when he protests that "the Missouri delegation to the National Convention will be a delegation devoted to the support of Governor Folk." We doubt that Governor Folk could be nominated, and we doubt a good deal more that he could be elected if he should be nominated, but the interesting feature of this wholly unexpected, and some persons think, indefensible attitude of the Senator from Missouri, is that it will disfigure, if it do not destroy, the boom for Mr. Clark, which has been booming along at a most encouraging rate since the election last November when the Democrats secured a fine working majority in the lower house of Congress. We should say that Mr. Clark would make a more effective candidate for President than Governor Folk, and this is not saying a great deal for Governor Folk. Mr. Clark's chief claim to

the presidential nomination is that for sixteen years or so he has never lowered his colors, and has protested that the time would come when the Republicans would be driven out of power and the Democrats would resume their ancient and honorable control of the affairs of this country. One of the files in the Clark cabinet is the apparent disposition of a somewhat conspicuous gentleman in Nebraska to espouse his cause. That would be very bad for Mr. Clark. If Mr. Bryan is conducting the nomination, as he will surely try to do, the natural and logical thing would be for Mr. Bryan to nominate himself. He is stronger with the country than any of his understudies.

THE DIVORCE CANCER.

Out in Chicago they are keeping a score of the proceedings of the marriage license bureau and the divorce courts with the result that in the first seventeen days of the present month the marriage license bureau was thirty licenses ahead of the same period last year, but on the other hand, the divorce courts were thirty-seven ahead of the record made last year. The figures for June show that out of 100 couples married nearly ten seek divorce. Several of the Cook County Judges have decided that as divorce is so nearly the ultimate port of the average Chicago couple they will not perform any more marriages. This is a nice state of affairs in the community which claims to be moral, but the divorce evil is spreading throughout the country. The correct position on the divorce question is that taken by South Carolina as a State and by the Roman Catholic Church as a Church. In South Carolina there is no divorce and there never has been except during the period of negro domination in that State; in the Catholic Church marriage is a sacrament, and not an estate to be entered into unadvisedly, but in the fear of God. If American society is ever to be clean and self-respecting the divorce cancer must be cut out.

"STINGING" THE GOVERNMENT.

About one million dollars has been spent by the Federal Department of Justice for special counsel in "trust-busting" and allied litigation for the last two years under the appropriation for the enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law. The progress made by the Taft administration in enforcing the Sherman act has been marked by the retention of high-priced lawyers otherwise unconnected with the legal department of the Government. These fees have been paid to special counsel:

Henry L. Stimson, sugar fraud prosecution	\$83,320.87
Frank B. Kellogg, Union Pacific and Standard Oil cases	49,817.13
J. C. McReynolds, anti-trust cases	35,516.57
Cordell A. Severance, anti-trust cases	28,237.91
B. D. Townsend, land fraud cases	24,018.72
S. R. Rush, land fraud cases	19,353.17
W. T. Denison, sugar fraud cases	25,025.00
Peyton Gordon, land fraud cases	19,934.49
Jesse C. Adkins, cotton leak cases	16,687.58
J. W. Barrett, oleomargarine cases	10,449.55
Morgan H. Beach, condemnation of Meridian Hill	10,260.00
D. C. Becker, Oregon land fraud cases	15,788.62
A. A. Birney, condemnation of squares 43 and 49, D. C.	12,000.00
Pierce Butler, bleached flour and United States vs. Swift	10,000.00
Marion E. Carter-Greene, Clayton case	16,435.00
H. C. Cause, examining United States lands of District of Columbia	10,372.27
F. A. Maynard, coal land fraud cases	12,523.61
J. H. Wilkerson, various prosecutions	13,329.48

These figures are taken from a special report submitted by Attorney-General Wickersham to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. The statement asserts that from March 5, 1909, to May 31, 1911, a total of \$845,184.56 was thus paid out to "special assistants to the Attorney-General or to district attorneys." All this is aside from the regular cost of maintaining the Department. There is an Attorney-General, a Solicitor-General, a corps of assistant Attorney-Generals and a special assistant to the Attorney-General.

Henry L. Stimson, the present Secretary of War, resigned some months ago as District Attorney and was appointed a special assistant to prosecute the sugar cases. The detailed statement of payments to him since March 5, 1909, in that case, as transmitted by the Department, is as follows:

Henry L. Stimson, special assistant sugar fraud cases	\$9,000.00
D. O. do.	5,000.00
D. O. do.	55,000.00
Expenses	14,320.87
Total	\$83,320.87

Adding to this total, the \$25,000.00 that was paid to W. T. Denison in these same sugar fraud cases, there is produced a total of \$108,320.87 paid to two lawyers in two years in that one case.

James C. McReynolds, who handled the case against the Tobacco Trust, was an assistant Attorney-General. He, like Stimson, resigned and took special employment in the Tobacco case. This is an old case and the \$35,516.57 which Mr. Reynolds is credited with drawing since March 5, 1909, does not indicate the legal expenses since the case began long before 1909.

S. R. Rush was a mere law clerk in the Department. He was made special assistant in the land fraud cases and has in the last two years drawn \$19,353.17 for that service.

Wade H. Ellis, of Ohio, was assistant to the Attorney-General. He resigned his position to try to pull the

Republicans through in his State last fall. He carried away with him for two years' work in the anti-trust cases the neat sum of \$11,717.73.

H. C. Gauss was private secretary to Attorney-General Bonaparte. He was assigned the job of examining lands of the United States in the District of Columbia. For that he has suddenly risen from a small secretary's salary to \$10,372.27 that he drew from March 5, 1909, to May 31, 1911.

As Judson Welliver says in the Washington Times—and Welliver is making Washington rather uncomfortable with his political articles these days—"next to being a trust, about the best thing financially to which aspiration may be directed, is the occupation of a trust-buster." This is true of Frank B. Kellogg, of St. Paul. He is Republican national committeeman for the State of Minnesota. He is a member of the executive committee of the national committee. Also he is a member of the law firm of Kellogg & Severance, of St. Paul. This firm does a "general business"—especially with the Government. Mr. Kellogg was lately asked, during a Government inquiry, about his service as attorney for Steel Trust subordinate corporations in Minnesota. He vigorously defended his right to accept such service. As Welliver says, "he has continued it many years at gratifying profit." Mr. Kellogg was retained to direct the "busting" of the Union Pacific and Standard Oil mergers, back in the Roosevelt administration. Later, Mr. Severance, his partner, was employed at \$20,000 per annum, in which work he has since March 5, 1909, drawn \$28,237.91. The firm seems to have collected in these two years a total of \$77,155.04. The cases are four or five years old. The amounts received before the advent of the Taft administration are not down; the grand total derived from this particular employment can be imagined. It has been generally thought that men like Kellogg and Severance were so unselfishly patriotic that they were willing to leave a lucrative law practice to serve the Government at a reasonable wage, but they are, instead, obedient unto the advice of Omar "Take the cash, and let the credit go."

This state of affairs in the legal department of the Government is highly discreditable to the Department. The results are not for the good of the country or for the betterment of the legal service rendered the nation. There is dissatisfaction on account of the liberality the Government has shown to the special assistants. In several other departments the Government employs many lawyers at modest salaries. Large cases, involving the Interstate Commerce and other laws, public domain, etc., are carried to the Supreme Court, and there argued and won by lawyers who get only \$3,000 or \$4,000 the year. These lawyers have humble positions. They give all of their time to the Government. They go up against the best corporate lawyers in the nation. Yet they get no big fees as "special assistants." Nobody saw, the fortunate ones in the Department of Justice gets those. As the Times says, "the result of this discrimination is disaffection on the part of the men who work all the time and draw the small salaries, while the more favored ones get the big cases, the big publicity, the big opportunities and the big fees."

What we would like to know is this: Why can't the regular assistants to the Attorney-General do the work themselves? Is the employment of outside counsel an admission of inefficiency? Who told Stimson and McReynolds that if they gave up their regular government jobs they would get better special Government jobs? Incidentally, has all this legal expense been worth while?

FAME'S DEMOCRACY.

The New Orleans Picayune says: "From what may be considered time immemorial, the breeding of domestic animals so as to get the best results as to quality, strength, form and service has been carried on. The ancestors of horses and cattle have been carefully looked after, and even dogs have been brought into the animal aristocracy. The careful breeding of animals has brought into existence the best and most serviceable varieties possessing the desired qualities of their kind. But while the breeding of animals has been carried on, the result in their offspring is entirely reliable with regard to beasts, birds and even fishes. It cannot be applied to the human race. So far from distinguished children being, as a rule, the offspring of eminent ancestry, the contrary is usually the rule."

The Picayune cites some interesting facts in a careful study of this subject. Sir Francis Galton, who has been a copious writer on the eugenics of heredity of the English race, made a dictionary of 25,000 names of persons who were eminent in one way or another. It was shown in this compilation that two hundred persons in every million had reached such distinction as entitled them to places in the record mentioned.

Parents of great talents and ability who have secured a place in the world's hall of fame rarely had children possessing anything of their parents' qualities. Neither Alexander, Caesar nor Napoleon had children who are remembered in history. Democracy seems to rule the human species so far as mental distinction goes. The great men of the world have their day, and none is left to inherit their honors or to render the service that won those honors, while new names and new interests are appearing from time to time out of obscurity to lead or to instruct or to light the pathway of the race.

A writer in the London Nineteenth Century, making deductions from his

studies of Galton's Dictionary of British Biography, notes, taking the artists, that Romney was the son of a Westmoreland carpenter and cabinet-maker; Reynolds, of a Devonshire clergyman, in whose family there was some academic and mathematical ability; Turner, of a London barber, and Wilkie, of a Scots minister. The poets do not give us any more help. Sir Walter Scott was the son of an Edinburgh lawyer; Shelley, of a baronet and country gentleman; Tennyson, of a Lincolnshire clergyman; Southey, of a Bristol linen draper; James Thomson, of a Scots minister; Wordsworth, of a Cumberland attorney and land agent, while his mother was the daughter of a morcer. Of the inventors, Thomas Telford was a shepherd's son; George Stephenson was the son of a miner, who possessed some mechanical ingenuity, and James Watt alone may be considered to have inherited his talents from a father who was a contractor and mechanic of no especial standing.

It is hard to see where any young relative of Sir Joshua Reynolds could have had a better environment for the development of artistic talents than in the studio of a great master, but no members of his family, except two sisters, showed any hereditary aptitude for art. Sir Christopher Wren's son was neither an architect nor a scientist. The children of Sir Walter Scott did not follow in their father's footsteps. Wordsworth's children were not poets. Romney's son was not a painter.

The only human beings who are surrounded with special environments in the matter of their ancestry and descendants are the members of royal families to whom the crown descends. They are educated especially for the place. They are made fully aware of the great responsibilities that are to come to them some day. Their wives and husbands are carefully chosen for them. How seldom, though, does any great ruler rise beyond the level of mediocrity. If some King was the founder of a line of monarchs, the succession is frequently lost in obscurity, and if there is to be a revival or restoration of the greatness of the monarchy, some alien out of the blood of the great founders of the dynasty revives and restores.

There is no aristocracy of genius. It is democratic. Not all the applications of the principles of eugenics can accomplish an inheritance of intellect and ability. It is the gift of God, oft bestowed in squalid surroundings and among the humblest and least intellectual people.

The State tax roll of New Jersey for the current year shows that there are in that State 7,903 corporations liable to taxation. These corporations will pay taxes on \$2,479,000,000, and what they will turn into the treasury will pay for all of the expenses of the government and leave a neat balance. New Jersey, the home of trusts, makes them work for her while they pray on the rest of the republic.

Mr. William D. Richardson contributes another interesting letter to the Times-Dispatch to-day. "He is much alive and a kicker," but far better than that, he "has unbounded faith in the future prosperity of Richmond." There is nothing "pseudo" about that. Nearly everybody of good digestion in this town feels the same way, and in this spirit we shall make a good deal of progress.

The Hon. William Jennings Bryan spoke in the Presbyterian Church at Laurens, South Carolina, last Sunday at the hour of stated services. His object was "The Bible," and he knew what he was talking about. We do not know where he could have found an audience that needed it more.

Voice of the People


Unbounded Faith in Richmond.
To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir,—Without attempting a lengthy defense of the assertion that certain newspapers ignore local conditions which are not to the credit of the community and might be remedied (proofs of which are open to any one who bothers to get out of the way of pseudo-critics, and has unbounded faith in the future prosperity of Richmond), I beg to observe:

The bare statement of large bank clearings (in your editorial of this date) looks pretty in type and reads well to a statistician. But do you quite realize the full meaning of the item "loans and discounts"? The law fixes certain conditions as to security and rate of interest, under which a bank may lend out its own capital and its depositors' money; hence the bank takes but small risk. On the other hand, the borrower, under the bank, the manufacturer and merchant, is the instrument of prosperity, the maker of new business. Unless you realize the home of the big goods do not indicate true conditions in the half-thousand manufacturers in this city. W. M. RICHARDSON.

Richmond, June 19.

Sonnet—To Ideals.

Few, like a Hell are times without that thing
Which is well named, and of Experi-
Ideals govern men (not laws). A King
Is but the personation of a thought.
So are men swayed! Democracy is
weak—
Having no higher aim than numbers
bring;
The science of Nature doth Perfection
seek.
And truthful Art can teach us every-
thing.
So is a Nation strong—in Song and
Story.
And weak, who love not Truth, nor
seek the good within.
The Shepherd piping 'neath the starry
glory
Was rich in Soul, and Poet of Man-
kind.
Who writes a truthful rhyme, sooth
good seed,
Who sings the songs of men in King
indeed!
EDMOND FONTAINE.
Charlottesville, August, 1900.



Harris' Water
ANTI-DYSPEPTIC
"Begets Health"

Makes it possible to forget your dyspepsia, indigestion and kidney troubles.

"Ask your druggist about this medicine. Sold by all druggists—just as it comes from the factory."

J. A. MORRIS & CO., Distributors
211 North 6th St., Richmond, Va.

Daily Queries and Answers

Fourth of July Accidents.
Can you give me any facts as to Fourth of July accidents? I have been unable to find any statistics. E. J. The Journal of the American Medical Association has kept a record of the celebration of the United States due to the celebration of Independence Day in the past eight years. Following are the figures: 1903, killed 468, injured 3,393; 1904, killed 182, injured 4,941; 1905, killed 158, injured 5,308; 1907, killed 168, injured 4,249; 1908, killed 163, injured 4,469; 1909, killed 215, injured 5,367; 1910, killed 131, injured 4,223; 1911, for the eight years, killed 1,662, injured 35,620.

The figures show that since 1903, 37,282 persons have been injured as a result of Fourth of July celebrations, of which 1,452 died. Of the 72 cases of loss of limbs, 37 of which were fatal, 7 persons lost their sight, 32 lost one eye, 26 lost legs, arms or hands and 114 lost fingers. Of the 72 cases of loss of limbs, 37 of which were fatal, 7 persons lost their sight, 32 lost one eye, 26 lost legs, arms or hands and 114 lost fingers. Of the 72 cases of loss of limbs, 37 of which were fatal, 7 persons lost their sight, 32 lost one eye, 26 lost legs, arms or hands and 114 lost fingers. Of the 72 cases of loss of limbs, 37 of which were fatal, 7 persons lost their sight, 32 lost one eye, 26 lost legs, arms or hands and 114 lost fingers.

The decrease from 466 deaths in 1903 to 131 in 1910 was due to same methods of celebrating, the most marked decrease taking place in those States where the agitation for restrictive measures was strongest.

LORD DYNEVOR NOW IN HOUSE OF LORDS

BY LA MARQUESE DE FONTENAY.
LORD DYNEVOR (pronounced "Dinner"), whose accession to the House of Commons, through his father's death, creates a vacuum in the Conservative ranks of the House of Commons, boasts of descent from Lady Margaret, half-sister of King Arthur of the Round Table celebrity, and is chief of one of the oldest of Welsh families. He is lineally descended in the male line from Roderick the Great, the last King of united Wales, who died in the ninth century, and whose three sons divided Wales between them. Lord Dynevor is descended from the son who inherited the principality of South Wales.

The family has been in the possession of the Dynevor Castle estate from time immemorial. The ancient castle itself, which dominates the Valley of Towy, in Carmarthenshire, in ruins, and the modern mansion, which was built a little over a hundred years ago, has little pretensions to beauty, though the interior is rich with its old furniture, some hundreds of years old, is magnificent.

Lord Dynevor, like most other Englishmen of rank, has put in some years as private secretary to cabinet ministers, notably to Lord George Hamilton, when Minister for India, and to Lord Selkirk, when First Lord of the Admiralty. He is married to a daughter of Lord Jersey, owner of Childs' Bank in London, and it, like his father, has been a grand old world.

The late Lord Dynevor had a number of adventures while traveling, and was just leaving San Francisco when the earthquake took place there, six years ago, escaping with no other loss than that of a silk hat, which, along with the hat-box, perished in the catastrophe.

The Lord Gifford whose death has taken place so suddenly at Old Park, his country seat in Sussex, near Chichester, must not be confounded with the young Lord Gifford who was over 100 years old when he died. He is the son and heir of the Marquis of Tweeddale. The Lord Gifford who has just been gathered to his fathers was taken ill while on a tour of inspection of the Victoria Cross during the Boer War of 1874, not for one, but for several years of heroism, being the first man to account for a grand old world.

He was again on the staff of the Marquis of Tweeddale in the South African War of 1878, and although he did not actually receive the Victoria Cross, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Order. He was again on the staff of the Marquis of Tweeddale in the South African War of 1878, and although he did not actually receive the Victoria Cross, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Order.

Charles II. purchased it from the Russells for his favorite son, the Duke of Monmouth, and when the latter lost his head on the scaffold, after a vain attempt to wrest the throne from the Duke of York, the Duke of Monmouth was beheaded. Many of these tales, still in existence, were already noted for their age when the Duke of Monmouth was beheaded. The Duke of Monmouth was beheaded. Many of these tales, still in existence, were already noted for their age when the Duke of Monmouth was beheaded.

On the death of the widowed Duchess of Monmouth and of Buccleuch, Moor Park was sold to a man of the name of Buccleuch, who had acquired an enormous fortune through the South Sea Bubble, and who caused the house to be almost entirely rebuilt, according to the designs of the famous Italian architect, Giacomo Leoni, assisted by Sir William Townhill, Lord Anson, its subsequent possessor, had the gardens laid out by the famous landscape gardener, "Capability" Brown. Through the Ansons, Moor Park came into the possession of the house of Grosvenor, where the Duke of Westminster is the chief.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Company.)

Lord Ebury, who in a public letter

GOING ABROAD

To those contemplating a foreign trip we suggest the convenience of TRAVELERS' CHECKS or LETTER OF CREDIT. The holding of the checks not only insures ready money, but gives the traveler a standing in foreign cities at all times.

National State and City Bank

Richmond, Virginia

Wm. H. Palmer, Pres. Wm. M. Hill, Vice-Pres.
Jno. S. Ellett, Vice-Pres. J. W. Sinton, Vice-Pres.
Julien H. Hill, Cashier.